

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/669,689

Applicant(s)

YAN ET AL.

Examiner

Maryam Monshipouri

Art Unit

1652

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Maryam Monshipouri.

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. Justin D. Kaajala.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 April 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 25,26,32-35,40 and 41.

Identification of prior art discussed: Godbout et al., SPTREMBL Database, Accession No. Q63902, 11/1996.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The new matter issue directed to 99% identity to SEQ ID NO:1 or DNA encoding SEQ ID NO:2 (see base claims 25-26) was brought up to the attention of Mr. Karjala. In response Mr. Karjala proposed substituting " 99% " with "95% " identity in said claims. However, in view of prior art cited above such amendment would render the claims anticipated. Hence, it was mutually decided to cancel said claims and their dependent claims in an Examiner's amendment. Mr. Karjala also agreed to file a terminal disclaimer to overcome the obviousness type double patenting with respect to claims issued in U.S. patent No. 6,461,646. .